

would support Senator Withem's and Lindsay's amendment and then the passage of the bill as it would then stand.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Before I proceed to the next speaker, I would like to introduce some guests of Senator Schellpeper. We have his son and his wife, Tom and DaNita Schellpeper, from Stanton. Would you please stand and be welcomed by the Legislature. Thank you for being with us. The next speaker is Senator Schellpeper. I do not see Senator Schellpeper. We'll go to Senator Wehrbein. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I rise in support of the Withem amendment to the amendment. I think, clearly, I don't have any problem with the concept of a study being done by the Department of Revenue with respect to the affects of the...of the tax on livestock. I think that there's...there's clearly no objection simply to that, in and of itself. I guess I would like to see the Withem amendment adopted to remove the...the legislative finding language, however. In general terms, I did want to discuss just briefly exactly what it is we're doing with the...with the committee amendment to LB 447. Essentially, as has been pointed out, what we've done is we've taken a...a bill that went to the Agriculture Committee. The Agriculture Committee has gutted that bill and put in an amendment that is clearly a revenue amendment. Now, what we've...what we do, the way that we have our Legislature structured, we allow committees a good deal of latitude when it comes, in fact complete latitude when it comes to adopting amendments of any type. Any committee is completely free to...to change a bill in any manner that it sees fit, with a majority of the members of the committee voting to do so. However, I think that we are starting to stray into a dangerous area when we have a committee taking a completely...a subject completely foreign to that committee and putting it into an amendment of a bill in that committee. I think if that becomes standard practice around here, I, for example, have several bills I've been unable to get out of the Judiciary Committee. There's nothing to prevent me from going to the Revenue Committee, where I may have a friendlier response in trying to get four of my friends, on the Revenue Committee, to vote with me and change a meaningless bill in the Revenue Committee into a...into a bill that's in the shape that I would like to get out of the Judiciary Committee, and then having that bill advanced. I think we're straying into dangerous waters, if that becomes a practice that we all begin to use. And I don't want to